1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO	
2		STERN DIVISION
3		
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERIC	CA, . Case No. 1:12-cr-043
5	Plaintiff,	
6	- v -	. Sentencing .
7	TRACY BIAS,	. Wednesday, May 21, 2014
8	Defendant.	
9		9:35 a.m.
10	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	
11	BEFORE THE	HONORABLE MICHAEL R. BARRETT
12		FIMOTHY D. OAKLEY, ESQ. (AUSA)
13	2	United States Attorney's Office 221 East Fourth Street, Suite 400
14		Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
15		JOHN T. KELLER, ESQ.
16	1	2345 Kemper Lane P.O. Box 6129
17		Cincinnati, Ohio 45206
18	[	PETER COLIN LINK, ESQ. B10 Sycamore Street, Fifth Floor Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
19		
20		Agent Christopher Kresnak, DEA Agent Brian Carroll, FBI
21		Keith Manfra, U.S. Pretrial Services
22		Lindsay Potrafke, Esq.
23		Barbara A. Crum
24		Maryann T. Maffia, RDR 239 Potter Stewart U.S. Courthouse 100 E. Fifth Street
25		Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

## PROCEEDINGS

COURTROOM DEPUTY: On the docket this morning is

District Court Case Number 1:12-CR-43, Defendant 1: United

States of America versus Tracy Bias.

We're here this morning for sentencing.

2.5

THE COURT: All right. Counsel want to enter their appearances for the record, please.

MR. OAKLEY: Good morning, Your Honor. Tim Oakley for the United States.

MR. KELLER: John Keller on behalf of Mr. Bias.

MR. LINK: Peter Link, also on behalf of Mr. Bias.

THE COURT: Okay. You guys, if you want to work from the table, that's fine as long as you stay close to a microphone. Otherwise, you can stay at the podium, wherever you're most comfortable.

You guys want to work from the table? Okay, that's good.

Okay. Let's just recap. It was almost a year ago, I guess, on June 7th, 2013, Mr. Bias appeared in front of me. He entered a plea of guilty to Conspiracy to Distribute and Dispense a Controlled Substance, which was the first count of the Superseding Indictment. There was a Plea Agreement.

We'll talk a little bit more about that when we get to that stage of the proceeding. The case was referred to the Probation Department for a PSI. It was originally cut on

August 26th of last year and revised in the fall. I have

received the government's Sentencing Memorandum as well as the 1 2 defendant's Sentencing Memorandum. So Tim, have you received a copy of -- well, obviously you 3 4 have yours, but did you receive a copy of defendant's 5 memorandum and the PSI? 6 MR. OAKLEY: Your Honor, I've received a copy of the 7 PSI and the objections contained within. I'm not sure that I 8 have received a separate Sentencing Memorandum. 9 THE COURT: It was Document 229. 10 MR. OAKLEY: We're prepared to proceed regardless. THE COURT: All right. 11 12 Counsel, you guys have received everything, correct, and 13 discussed it with Mr. Bias? 14 MR. LINK: Yes, Your Honor. 15 MR. KELLER: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. And I also have an updated, I 16 guess dated May 15th, an updated health situation on Mr. Bias 17 18 regarding his high blood pressure and his neck and back pain 19 and that bit. We can talk about that at the appropriate time. 20 Is that all right? 21 MR. LINK: Yes. 22 THE COURT: Okay, good. So the officer that wrote 23 the report used the 2010 edition of the Guidelines Manual. 24 As we go through, if you guys have objections, let's just run 2.5 through them at the time.

But in any event, a violation of 21 U.S.C. 841(a) is governed by Guideline 2D1.1. And we all know the way you use that is you use the Drug Quantity Table to find out the amount of drugs involved in this case. The agents in this case provided extensive information on the amount of medication provided, so we think he is Offense Level 38 according to the probation officer.

All right. And then we have the injury that occurred

November 4, 2009. William Adams became a patient at the

Portsmouth clinic, started on OxyContin. He died November 5th

after consuming a portion of the OxyContin that was

prescribed. Mr. Bias denies any causation between his

behavior and Mr. Adams' death.

He's still a 38. Then we have adjustment for role in the offense. He was clearly an organizer. Mr. Bias and Mr. Journey managed this operation, devised the scheme, so there was a two-level adjustment that was considered by the probation officer, and the added adjusted offense level becomes a 40.

Then you have acceptance of responsibility by entering the plea, which is a negative 2; and then the timely fashion, which he did, got another point off. So he ends up at a 37.

His Criminal History would put him at a category of a Roman numeral II.

So at the end of day he would have an offense level

calculation of 37, a Criminal History of II, which would give him a guidelines provision of up to 235 to 240 months. The Probation Department in this case has recommended a 235-month sentence. Supervised release is three years to life. They recommended three years. He is not eligible for probation.

A fine we can discuss later. It could be up to a million dollars, but I'll talk to defense counsel about that. And there is also a one-hundred-dollar special assessment.

There was the Plea Agreement in this case which talked about sentencing limitations, which we'll get to when we're ready.

As to the actual calculation itself, based on his criminal history, the amount of narcotics involved in this case, are there any objections to that calculation?

MR. LINK: Yes, there are, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Let's run through them.

MR. LINK: Although an enhancement hasn't been placed in the assessment for that purpose, we object to the inclusion of Mr. Adams and facts pertaining to Mr. Adams in that investigation or in the sentencing. The law is pretty clear that unless facts regarding a death are admitted to or proven to a jury, that they cannot be considered by the Court in sentencing. So I'd like to put that out there.

Now, that -- it really makes not much of a difference as they are calculating the 38 Base Offense Level based on the

quantity of drugs involved, but I would like to, again, put that on the record that the alleged death is not proper for the Court to consider at this time.

THE COURT: Tim?

MR. OAKLEY: Your Honor, with all due respect, I think it's a misstatement of the facts and the law. If we're talking about Apprendi, I would agree that it would need to be proven, but this doesn't change either the mandatory minimum, the maximum potential under the law, or it doesn't affect the Guidelines whatsoever. What it is is, it's stated in there that he died. There is no dispute that he died, there's no dispute, I don't think, that he died of a drug overdose; but it was not used to enhance his guideline sentencing in any fashion. What it does show, as we said in our memorandum, it's just another example of the damage that these pills were causing to the community. If anything, it may be a factor the Court can consider in the 3553.

The Court can consider any factor it wants under 3553, including acquitted conduct. But again, Your Honor, I don't believe that it's really an objection that needs to be ruled upon by the Court; but if it is, it should be denied.

THE COURT: Yeah. I mean, I'm not sure it comes under the category of a clear objection anyway.

But Tim, just in terms of the sentencing in this case and, counsel, in terms of the sentencing, I think the width and

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
breadth of this conspiracy was large enough that, in arriving
at eventual sentence in this case, I am not going to take the
actual death into consideration. I don't think that's
necessary for me to get where I am going to end up, in all
likelihood, after reading the PSI and both sets of memorandum.
    So for the Court of Appeals purposes, I am not going to
consider that as part of a sentencing enhancement.
         MR. LINK: There is one other issue, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Go ahead.
         MR. LINK: Now, the presentence investigation clearly
states that the Plea Agreement had no impact on the
recommended range. However, I would point out to the Court --
         THE COURT: Could I ask one question? Was the Plea
Agreement sealed?
         MR. OAKLEY: I believe it was.
         THE COURT: Well, so are we --
         MR. OAKLEY: We'd move to unseal it, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Do you have an objection to the Plea
Agreement being unsealed? Otherwise, I'm going to ask some
people to leave.
         MR. LINK: We have no objection.
         MR. OAKLEY: And it may have been unsealed at the
trial of Steven Hillman also.
         THE COURT: Barb says it was, so it's already been
unsealed. Okay. That's all right.
```

I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MR. LINK: The presentence investigation report says that the Plea Agreement itself has no impact on the calculation. However, at the time this Court accepted Mr. Bias plea on June 7th of last year, there was a discourse that was had. In that plea colloquy, it was explained to Mr. Bias that the offense level would be a 37; and that after applying the three-point reduction for continued acceptance of responsibility, which has been applied in this case, that the offense level would be reduced to a 34.

We would ask that the Court honor that as that was what was represented in open court and that is the understanding that Mr. Bias had in entering into his plea.

THE COURT: Okay. Hang on one second. I do have a copy of one part of the transcript, but I don't believe -- all I have is the part where it's filed under seal. Hang on one second.

MR. LINK: We are talking at pages 13 and 14, Your Honor, beginning at line 15.

THE COURT: Yeah, I'm not -- that's what I'm saying, counsel. I don't have those. I've just got the earlier part.

Looking in the Plea Agreement, where do we talk about the calculation where it would have led to a 34?

MR. OAKLEY: It's paragraph 3, Your Honor, that the

defendant understands that the United States believes the level is a 37. He also understands that they are advisory and not mandatory.

Continuing one with paragraph 3, the Court is required to consider them but not required to follow them. It may impose a sentence higher or lower based on the applicable range of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines of the offense under the Indictment.

He has reviewed it and understands how they may apply to this case but does not bind the Court.

THE COURT: Okay. Got it. If it was a 34, it would be a 168 to 210? Is that right? Okay.

What about the -- you want to talk about the -- discuss the cap in the Plea Agreement?

MR. LINK: Yes, Your Honor, if we could.

Now, as to that cap, as the Court knows, this case was only resolved by a plea, but that plea was only reached after Mr. Bias was able to reach an agreement with the government and an understanding with this Court. As we've already noted, the Court represented to Mr. Bias that the level would be a 34 with the three-point reduction for acceptance of responsibility, but --

THE COURT: Well, I think as Mr. Oakley points out, I don't think "represented" would have been the word. It would have been suggested.

MR. LINK: It was asked if Mr. Bias understood that to be the case, and he said yes.

THE COURT: Right. I also asked him if he understood that everything was subject --

MR. LINK: Not binding on the Court, yes.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. LINK: Yes. That was fully explained to Mr. Bias at the time.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LINK: Your Honor, first of all, this plea was only reached after the Statement of Facts was amended to omit any allegations that Mr. Bias owned Trinity Health Care or that Mr. Bias sponsored patients to this clinic or any of the clinics involved. After that had been amended and after that Amended Statement of Facts was accepted by the government, the government agreed that it would seek a sentence of no more than ten years if Mr. Bias cooperated, but also agreed that if Mr. Bias did not cooperate, that it would move to withdraw his plea. And that's at paragraph 5 of the Plea Agreement, I believe.

In this case, nobody is contesting that Mr. Bias shouldn't get the three-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility, but the government's position is now that the sentencing level should be a 37 after the three-point reduction. And even though nobody is arguing that Mr. Bias

```
shouldn't get the reduction for acceptance of responsibility,
1
 2
    the government's position is now that he didn't cooperate.
        The government is primarily basing these claims that he
 3
 4
    didn't cooperate on -- because Mr. Bias still won't admit that
 5
    he owns Trinity Health Care and because he discussed an
    earlier version of the Statement of Facts with his former
 6
 7
    attorney, Steve Hillman.
 8
        As to the fist of these claims, Your Honor, Mr. Bias --
 9
             THE COURT: What is the timing of that discussion?
    Was Hillman still representing him or was it post-Hillman's --
10
             MR. LINK: At that time he was still representing him
11
12
    in the civil forfeiture action, which was surrendered as --
13
             THE COURT: Well, I think he fired him in open court,
    didn't he, if I remember?
14
15
             MR. OAKLEY: He moved -- well, what happened --
             THE COURT: Hillman didn't --
16
             MR. OAKLEY: Hillman had filed a civil action to
17
18
    recover property on his own that was not authorized by
19
    Mr. Bias.
20
             THE COURT: Right. And Mr. Bias confirmed that?
             MR. OAKLEY: Mr. Bias confirmed. But at that same
21
    time, Mr. Bias had two defense counsel: Mr. Link and
22
23
    Mr. Keller. Mr. Hillman was not representing Mr. Bias in the
24
    criminal.
25
             MR. LINK: That is true, Your Honor. And not only
```

2.5

that, Your Honor, but Mr. Keller and I did advise Mr. Bias throughout the course of this to have no further contact with Steve Hillman. However --

THE COURT: Well, back up. Help me clarify. What's the timing of that conversation, as you understand it, versus the timing of signing off on the Plea Agreement?

MR. LINK: It was before and well before that point.

What was shared with Mr. Hillman was an initial proposed

Statement of Facts. There was some back-and-forth between the

United States Government and defense counsel as to amending

that Statement of Facts and finally reach an agreement by

which a plea could be had.

And so prior not only to signing the agreement, but prior to arriving at the Statement of Facts, which was eventually signed by Mr. Bias, Mr. Bias shared that earlier proposed Statement of Facts with Mr. Hillman.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LINK: Now, as to the allegations that there was some secret meeting, some type of clandestine operation, Your Honor, I would suggest to the Court this was two co-defendants discussing a case that they were both in, and that discussion happened before any agreement was reached with the government.

Now, a Plea Agreement, like all Plea Agreements, is basically a contract, Your Honor; and like all contracts, there is an implied duty of good faith that goes along with

that agreement. It would be hard to imagine a scenario where, in good faith, the United States Government could say that, by signing that agreement, Mr. Bias retroactively agreed to be cooperative in the past.

As to the second claim, Your Honor, that Mr. Bias still won't admit his ownership in Trinity, again, he has denied that all along. The government knew that he would deny that at the time that he signed the plea, and that language was removed from the Statement of Facts for that reason.

The government met with him, agreed to accept his plea, and was only able to get the plea as a result of agreeing to take that language out. So now it's hard to see how, again in good faith, the government could claim that he hasn't cooperated with them because he continues to deny what he denied all along.

The government knew these facts the whole time for the last almost year since it's accepted his plea, and the government could have said -- knowing that Mr. Bias would deny these things, it could have said, "You're a liar, Mr. Bias.

We don't believe you, and we're not going to accept your plea. You're going to trial." And they could have filed a motion to withdraw as required by the Plea Agreement, but they did not.

Instead, they let him waive his constitutional rights.

They had him agree to the forfeiture of certain property.

They had him meet with the government and its agents on

multiple occasions, finally had him testify at trial.

Now, frankly, Your Honor, that -- it can't -- that egg can't be unscrambled. They accepted his plea knowing these facts, and we are here today in good faith seeking good faith, and we're essentially asking for what was agreed to in that Plea Agreement.

THE COURT: Do you have anything else on that issue?

MR. LINK: Um, I could go on at length, Your Honor,
but I don't want to waste the Court's time as to this. I will
say for the record that at the time we were negotiating a plea
with the government, it was represented to defense counsel
that co-defendant Tracy Bias was going to be getting a
substantially larger sentence than what Mr. Bias and what was
contemplated in this Plea Agreement for Mr. Bias --

MR. KELLER: Not Tracy. Bart.

MR. LINK: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes. Mr. Journey was going to be given a substantially larger sentence than actually what was contemplated by Mr. Bias' Plea Agreement. Although we were not allowed to share the specific numbers of the sentence that was represented to us with Mr. Bias, that certainly went into part of our calculation as defense attorneys in recommending that Mr. Bias take this plea.

Needless to say, we were surprised to find that

Mr. Journey had recently been sentenced to five years in this

court on the same offense levels with nearly identical

conduct.

Now, as much as the government wants to make Mr. Bias out to be a criminal mastermind in this, Your Honor, this is a business model that was learned and known by Bart Journey as a result of working with his brother, Michael Journey, since as early as 2004. This is a business model that Mr. Journey pitched to his neighbor, Mr. Bias, and that Mr. Bias accepted. What was supposed to happen is that Mr. Bias was going to run one clinic while Mr. Journey ran the other, and they were going to split the profit 50/50.

And I would point out to the Court that while Mr. Bias is on tape saying that he would be satisfied with 12 patients a day at his clinic, it was actually Mr. Journey who was making money on the side by sponsoring patients to those clinics. It was Mr. Journey who, when he got caught, basically flipped and pled out. Mr. Journey has purportedly admitted his wrongdoing, and he has cooperated with the government and, with the same sentence guidelines, was sentenced to five years.

Now, Mr. Bias has admitted his wrongdoing. He has cooperated with the government. He, too, met with government's agents, testified at trial, and the government is trying to give him a sentence that's four times that of Mr. Journey's.

We're requesting a sentence that is more like that

contemplated by the Plea Agreement, a sentence of no more than ten years, which, I would point out, is twice that of what was given to Bart Journey.

THE COURT: Let's -- before I ask Mr. Oakley to speak, I mean, I think the key provisions I'll ask you guys to agree or disagree, but paragraph 6 indicates that if the government determines he has not complied with the terms of the agreement, they may move for sentencing enhancements -- I'm paraphrasing now -- which may have been in the PSI, which they have done through their Sentencing Memorandum.

The seventh paragraph is little bit more subjective. It requires complete and honest testimony.

And then in paragraph 16, the defendant acknowledges that after my full understanding of all the facts and circumstances, I could review the offense factors that are previously outlined, and if I determine them not appropriate, I am not obligated to accept such. At that point, he has no right to withdraw his plea.

So we've got all of that swirling around, so I'll as ask
Mr. Oakley for his comments on this.

MR. OAKLEY: Thank you, Your Honor. First, I'm not sure that what I heard was an objection, a proper objection, but more of a mitigation. We don't believe it was a proper objection, if that's what was the case.

To discuss now, if the Court wants, the Plea Agreement or

1 the cooperation, I'll be glad to do that. 2 THE COURT: Can I ask one question? I don't have a copy of the plea transcript in front of me. Oftentimes, if 3 4 there is a contemplated agreed-upon sentence I will make some 5 comments regarding that. Did I make such comments in this 6 case? 7 MR. OAKLEY: It was not an agreed-upon sentence, Your 8 Honor. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. 10 MR. LINK: You did, Your Honor. THE COURT: And what did I say? 11 12 MR. LINK: Hold on, just a moment here. 13 This is the Court speaking: "A couple of things that go into the mix on that. 14 15 Plea Agreement contemplates that you guys are agreeing the 16 appropriate guideline level is 37. That means something to you and your lawyer, and I'm sure he has explained what that 17 18 There is also a provision in there where the 19 government has indicated that because you entered the plea, 20 you should get two levels off that for acceptance of 21 responsibility. If that cooperation continues through the 22 time of the sentencing, there would be another level taken 23 off, which would take you down to a 34." 24 Hold on just a second. And I'm trying to find the exact

place where they speak about the ten-year cap.

25

```
1
             THE COURT: That's what I was curious.
 2
             MR. OAKLEY: It would have been in the plea colloquy,
    Your Honor.
 3
 4
             THE COURT: Right. I mean, I would have had a
 5
    discussion.
 6
             MR. OAKLEY: Yes, sir.
 7
             MR. LINK: I apologize, Your Honor.
 8
             THE COURT: That's okay.
 9
             (Pause in proceedings.)
             MR. LINK: It's right above that on page 14, I'm
10
    sorry, Your Honor, beginning at line 2.
11
        "They've" -- referring to the government -- "also
12
13
    indicated that if they seek your cooperation in this matter
    and you provide honest and truthful testimony" -- and I would
14
    point out that Mr. Bias testified at trial -- "they will not
15
    look for a sentence of more than ten years."
16
17
        I'd also direct the Court's attention to paragraph --
18
             THE COURT: So my question on that -- I mean, you
19
    guys have had pleas with me before. I sometimes focus in a
20
    little bit more on that, but it seems like I clearly caption
21
    that in terms of the truthful and honest testimony at this
    point, and I didn't make any promises to Mr. Bias where he
22
23
    would end up.
24
             MR. LINK: That is correct.
25
             THE COURT: Do you agree with that?
```

MR. OAKLEY: Yes, sir.

2.5

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LINK: Your Honor, I would point to paragraph 5 of Plea Agreement, though, which sets this agreement apart from others. This isn't simply a circumstance where the government has agreed to ask for more than ten years if it found Mr. Bias didn't cooperate.

At paragraph five, it says, "In the event that the defendant fails to provide complete cooperation as determined by the United States, the defendant and the United States understand and agree that the defendant has violated the terms of this agreement. The defendant further understands that the United States will move that the plea and plea offer be withdrawn and the defendant will face the charges as set forth in the entire Indictment."

Now, that reading means, Your Honor, that the government has agreed to either move to withdraw this plea if it found Mr. Bias didn't cooperate or it requests a sentence of no more than ten years if determine he did --

THE COURT: How do you reconcile that with paragraph 6 that says that if they make a determination that he has not complied with the terms of the Plea Agreement, they may move to avoid the enforcement of the Plea Agreement and they may use the sentencing enhancements? That seems to be what he has done in the Sentencing Memorandum.

MR. LINK: I would read that as a conjunctive with paragraph 5, so that they wouldn't require under the Plea Agreement to move to withdraw the Plea Agreement, and then they also may apply for sentencing enhancements that may be applicable in the case.

Here we have a Plea Agreement, and they've basically moved for all the enhancements that can be made. The Probation Department's made all the enhancements that can be made. And, most importantly, no motion was filed.

I mean, it was -- as we've already said, Your Honor,
Mr. Bias' statements and story hasn't changed since a year ago
prior to entering this Plea Agreement. It's been consistent
with the Statement of Facts that was agreed to by Mr. Bias and
the United States. The government could have at any time
said, "We don't believe you, and we're withdrawing. We are
moving to withdraw your plea. You are back to square one."

But it didn't. Instead, they continued to work with him and continued to meet with him, and ultimately asked him, called him to testify, required him to testify in open court in a federal trial, and he did.

The motion was never filed prior to that, and it's too late to file that motion now, Your Honor, under the terms of the Plea Agreement, which, again, is read like a contract.

They were required to do one or the other.

THE COURT: Mr. Oakley.

MR. OAKLEY: First of all, Your Honor, I would like to complete paragraph 5. It starts with he understands that the United States will be the sole determiner of whether or not he has truthfully complied with his obligation to cooperate as set forth in the plea. The United States retains the right to be the sole determiner as to whether or not Mr. Bias has told us the truth and fully cooperated.

I guess the -- you know, we're now left with a request to either withdraw the guilty plea and proceed to trial on all charges or just simply let this case go and receive a substantial sentence and not waste the Court's time.

We take exception to a couple of other things that was said. We did not seek any enhancements that were not -- we did not seek all the enhancements. He was clearly the leader/organizer. We didn't seek enhancement for the death. We didn't seek enhancement for the causing of injury to other patients. We have done that in the past, Your Honor. We have done that in other cases.

So to claim that we have misrepresented anything, quite frankly, is just not accurate, and we would take exception.

What we would tell the Court is that while the United
States was negotiating in good faith, I find it ironic to be
blamed for not being in good faith when the person who was
surreptitiously meeting with a co-defendant, Steven Hillman,
was Tracy Bias. They were going through what was a sealed

Statement of Facts and changing it to remove parts that involved Steven Hillman's involvement in the clinic. That's what was going on.

And I have to give Mr. Keller and Mr. Link credit. They didn't know it either. They told us afterwards. There were several drafts of the Plea Agreement made. The first removed the Trinity ownership. The Court heard the trial that ownership was -- the denial of ownership was bizarre, to say the least. There was testimony he would be sent and he -- Mr. Bias would be going up and visiting the clinic on a daily basis or close to a daily basis. They were checking the receipts. He had asked Dr. Lassiter to get information on the patients so that he can keep track of what was going on.

And then after that was removed, after the meeting of Mr. Hillman and Mr. Bias, the part about John Dahlsten's DEA registration number was removed at the time of the plea, that was the second change. This was after another meeting with Mr. Hillman, which, again, no one here knew.

The United States was acting in good faith. I believe
Mr. Link and Mr. Keller were acting in good faith. Mr. Bias
was not.

THE COURT: What's your assessment of -- you and the agents' assessment of his testimony at trial?

MR. OAKLEY: We found a lot of it to be confusing, contradicted by other evidence, especially knowing that it was

changed after meeting with Mr. Hillman. We had reservations about it. I don't know what was true and what was not. I know that the only people that were not surprised by some of the testimony was Mr. Bias and Mr. Hillman.

THE COURT: Tim, I don't want to go too deeply into this, but did Mr. Bias proffer anything before he met with Mr. Hillman, or how did all that work?

MR. OAKLEY: We had talked, and then we talked after the change of plea. Admittedly, it got rather heated as to what we were hearing. We finally -- we had been trying to put together why it was changed. We met before. And after we found out that there had been these meetings, it was changed. We confronted Mr. Bias, and he just simply did not make sense.

THE COURT: Did he ever fess up to these meetings?

MR. OAKLEY: No, no. I would say in proffers he did admit to sponsoring patients before. They were going to Florida to see the doctor, and that's where they came up with the idea of going to Portsmouth and open up their clinic.

I guess if we segue into that, because of a number of things that were said, this was a clinic that was opened up late in the pill game. This was opened up in '09 or thereabouts. By then, we had already had multiple clinics investigated, prosecuted, searched. This was not, you know, at the request of Bart Journey. This was an active, ongoing conspiracy with Mr. Bias at the helm also.

You know, they got tired of going to Florida because of the travel. Mr. Bias had a Florida driver's license. They came up here to sell pills to people. That's what happened. And then Mr. Hillman, he just simply changed his story in secret meetings.

The good faith was with the United States, at least at the time of the plea, or the good faith was with the United States, period, in trying to get to the bottom of this. To claim that we are not acting in good faith, I think, is ironic, as the only person who acted in bad faith was Mr. Bias with meeting in secret with Mr. Hillman.

I can go on, Your Honor, but I'm not sure that --

THE COURT: No. I mean, so what you are telling me at this point in time is that based upon you and your agents' assessment, he did not comply with being completely honest and giving you complete information as relates to this event, so you would say he has not lived up.

MR. OAKLEY: Your Honor, he has hedged. He has not provided complete and accurate testimony as required by the entirety of the plea at the discretion of the United States. We have tried to get to the truth, and some of what he said just simply continues not to make sense.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KELLER: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Yeah. How do you respond to that?

MR. KELLER: Mr. Oakley can correct me if I'm in error, but Mr. Link and I went to a meeting with the U.S. Attorneys where both agents were present that are in court today.

THE COURT: Right.

2.5

MR. KELLER: Mr. Oakley was there, and Ms. Glatfelter was there. I don't know the exact date of that meeting, but I believe it was at that meeting in the hall before we went in to speak with them that Mr. Bias acknowledged to us that he had, in fact, shared an earlier draft of a Statement of Facts with Mr. Hillman. And that was -- well, came as a total surprise to Mr. Link and I, but Mr. Bias did make that disclosure. And I believe then that it was discussed with the government parties at that conference which was all part and parcel of preparation for trial and Mr. Bias' testimony.

And so all of that was known as to how it all changed -- I think that's a little fuzzy. There was no proffer that had proceeded any of that, to my knowledge.

MR. LINK: Your Honor, I would add that, of course, our ethical obligations would prohibit us from sharing anything --

THE COURT: I get that.

MR. LINK: -- without Mr. Bias' permission. It was up to Mr. Bias that instructed us to let them know about his conversations with Mr. Hillman in an effort to be forthright.

THE COURT: In any event, do you agree with the language in the Plea Agreement that says after investigation and review the Court may determine the offense factors and recommendations are not appropriate and do not have to accept such, and in that event he does not have the right to withdraw his plea? So do you agree the ball is back in my court no matter which way I go on this?

MR. LINK: I do agree, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything else we need to talk about at this time?

MR. OAKLEY: Your Honor, I thought I was clear, but I do agree with Mr. Keller: they did bring it to our attention.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. OAKLEY: I would also note that, again, the
Statement of Facts was changed at the time of the plea taking
out Mr. Dahlsten's conversations, that the agent spoke to
Mr. Dahlsten and Mr. Bias about the lack of a license for
Dr. Dahlsten to write the prescription. That was taken out.
And I believe that was another meeting with Mr. Hillman.

MR. LINK: And as to that, Your Honor, it's interesting that that point is brought up because although I wasn't here for that plea colloquy, I have read the transcripts. Mr. Bias objected on the basis that he didn't know Dahlsten's license was expired. Now, of course, what happened is the DEA contacted the clinic and informed Mr. Bias

that, in fact, Dr. Dahlsten's license had expired.

Mr. Bias still has a difficulty understanding that that gives him actual knowledge, that the DEA calling and letting him know that a license, a DEA license was expired gives rise to actual knowledge on his behalf. It's these semantic issues that suggest Mr. Bias' lack of sophistication.

I mean, what's happening here is that Mr. Bias simply isn't as sophisticated as the government would make him out to be. While that makes him no less culpable for the conduct at issue, it certainly makes him no less cooperative either.

I understand that a conspiracy knowledge is imputed to all the participants and they can be held accountable even for things that they didn't actually know about, but to say that he didn't cooperate because he was unable to elucidate things that he doesn't actually have knowledge of is --

MR. KELLER: Judge, unrelated to this case, one other issue. I was contacted through Mr. Oakley by an agent in Kentucky, an Agent Dalrymple, who was conducting an independent investigation, the nature of which I don't fully know. But in an effort to continue to cooperate, and this is, I believe, after the trial, we did meet and had a video conference with two agents in Kentucky, two DEA agents. I'm just suggesting to the Court that there was a continuing cooperation.

THE COURT: But nobody is asking for a 5K.

MR. OAKLEY: I was contacted by an Agent Dalrymple.

I put him in contact with Mr. Keller. I have not heard since
then of anything that was done or is going to be done. I have
no idea of what has happened with that investigation.

MR. KELLER: Judge, nor do I. I just want the Court to be aware that he did, again, cooperate.

THE COURT: Okay. I understand.

All right. So here's where I am on this. I'm going to sustain at this time the total offense level of 37 and Criminal History Category of II. However, in terms of a variance, I'm going to consider my discussion with Mr. Bias in the Plea Agreement regarding a 34 as well as my discussion with the suggested cap. I'm not at this time saying exactly where that comes out, but that will be taken into consideration before the pronouncement of sentence.

So does anybody think they have to clarify anything on the record before we move forward?

MR. OAKLEY: The only other thing I guess I would add, Your Honor, is the discussion about Mr. Journey, the guidelines for the same calculations. Mr. Journey did multiple things in multiple cases and also had serious medical issues and received the sentence recommended by the United States. It has no bearing on what Mr. Bias did as far as his conduct with the United States.

THE COURT: I'm not sure I completely agree with

that, Tim, because I think I do look at other similarly situated defendants and try to find out how they are similarly they are situated. For both sides I will consider

Mr. Journey's ultimate sentence at arriving at a sentence in this case because I have thought about that before.

All right. Other than what we've already talked about, is there anything in the PSI that's disputed by defendants?

MR. LINK: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Tim?

MR. OAKLEY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. That being the case, I'm going to adopt the findings of fact as contained in the PSI as my own, of course with the limitation on the death. I'm not going to involve myself in that.

So I find that the defendant has entered a valid plea to Count One of the Superseding Indictment, which is a violation of 21 U.S.C. 841(a)(1). He's exposed to 20 years' imprisonment, a million-dollar fine, at least three years on supervised release and up to life if possible, and a one-hundred-dollar special assessment. We have already talked about where the calculations would lead us in this case.

Before we move into the actual discussion with the defendant and counsel and the government, is there anything anybody else needs to place of record at this time as to objections or whatever you think you need to make for the

Court of Appeals record? Either side.

MR. LINK: Solely, Your Honor, that we would request further reductions from the sentencing level in this case due to Mr. Bias' own health conditions.

THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about that in just a second. I'm talking about the actual reports and the statutory sentences as to calculations.

MR. LINK: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Oakley, anything?

MR. OAKLEY: No, sir.

THE COURT: That being the case, guys, do you have anything you wish to say in anticipation of the sentence or mitigation of the sentence, and does Mr. Bias wish to say anything at this time?

MR. LINK: Your Honor, I believe that we've covered most everything already. I would go back to the sentence disparity in this case between the proposed sentence and that of Mr. Journey. Again, this was a model that Mr. Journey had had in place at other clinics in the area working with his brother, David Michael Journey. This is a business model that he brought to Mr. Bias' attention and solicited Mr. Bias' participation. It was Mr. Journey who was sponsoring patients not only at these clinics but at other clinics in the area, and he's gotten five years.

We are asking, Your Honor, that the government would

further reduce the level possibly from a 34 all the way down to a 30 due to Mr. Bias' failing health, what we believe to be his overstated criminal history, and the assistance he has given to the government.

In the alternative, Your Honor, we'd asked for a downward departure from the guidelines as to impose a sentence of no more than ten years. That was contemplated by the Plea Agreement and, again, that would be twice that of what was given to Mr. Journey.

THE COURT: Since you mentioned health, the Probation Department's addendum indicates he does have chronic back pain, I guess from the neck injury, back and neck injury. He has high blood pressure. He has an abscess that's being treated, and I don't know exactly what the status of that is now.

It does seems like that would be something that will be cleared up just with due course; right?

MR. LINK: Yes. And that is an addendum to what was actually contained in the presentence investigation report itself.

In the presentence investigation report, it goes into a little more detail about his medical issues. There is mention of the surgery to remove the abscess at the base of his spine. He previously suffered a crushed pelvis and hip which gives him chronic pain conditions and necessitates the use of a cane

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

while he walks. He also has chronic high blood pressure; high cholesterol; bleeding in his spine that the doctor believes may be cancer; and I'm sorry for saying this in open court, but a knot between his scrotum and his rectum that needs to be evaluated; a 61 percent blockage of the left side of his heart; Class 3-4 angina; and a partially reversible defect in the interior wall of his heart for which a cardiac catheterization has been recommended. THE COURT: I mean, at some point he was supposed to take some medication for the heart issues, but he just doesn't do it. MR. LINK: Well, he has very limited assets, Your Honor, and no health insurance. He has had a hard time coming up with the money to get the medications recommended. THE COURT: Okay. John, is there anything you want to say? MR. KELLER: Nothing further, Your Honor. I believe it has been covered. THE COURT: Tracy, now is your opportunity to tell me anything that you think I should know before I hear from the government. THE DEFENDANT: Well, Your Honor, I'm very sorry that I ever got into this mess to start with. I do hate what has happened, not just because I'm in trouble but I do hate what it has done to other people, other families. And words cannot

change it, but I would just like for you to know that I am sorry.

MR. LINK: Your Honor, I'd like to add one thing about Steve Hillman. As everyone is aware in this case, Mr. Bias and Mr. Journey did enlist the services of Attorney Steven Hillman in this case early on in the life of these clinics.

Now, if I may say so, any attorney worth his salt would have told Mr. Bias, as a nonphysician and with a criminal history, to stay away from this, just get away from it.

Unfortunately, that's not the advice he was given.

Mr. Hillman did seize the opportunity and instead got himself a \$10,000-a-month retainer to advise Mr. Bias in how to skirt and essentially evade the law. Mr. Bias understood it to be how to comply with the law, but while some attorneys will advise their clients in an abundance of caution, there are those that would basically advise them how to do things they shouldn't be doing.

These clinics did generate money, and it was more money than Mr. Bias had ever seen in his life. Unfortunately, the allure of that money did cause Mr. Bias to do some stupid things. As he's said to the Court here, he is aware of the stupid decisions that he has made.

Unfortunately, he had surrounded himself with the likes of Mr. Journey and Mr. Hillman who had their own interests in

mind, if I may say so.

THE COURT: Anything else, guys?

Okay. On behalf of the government, Mr. Oakley?

MR. OAKLEY: Yes, sir. Thank you.

First, Your Honor, I know it's fashionable to blame other people who are not seated at the defense table, that somehow it's their fault for his actions. But Mr. Bias was traveling before he opened up this clinic to Florida to obtain pills, to sell pills, was sponsoring people to obtain pills and sell those pills. So to now be upset that what his actions have contributed to in Southern Ohio, Your Honor, I would hope would fall on a deaf ear.

Like I said, he started this clinic fairly late in what we've called a pill tsunami that just devastated Southern Ohio, and Scioto County in particular, where people were dying on a daily basis due to opiate addiction and overdose. He got into this at a time where the United States has already prosecuted a number of clinics, a number of doctors, already conducted a number of search warrants. So the pill problem obviously was not new in Portsmouth and obviously was known to Mr. Bias because he was traveling at great lengths, despite his physical ailments, to obtain and sell narcotics.

So to blame Mr. Journey now for that, Your Honor, I think is not quite accurate. Mr. Bias was more than a willing participant and more than a willing gatherer of the cash that

was generated. We have estimated, Your Honor, in a preliminary forfeiture, of approximately \$6.7 million that was illegally generated by Mr. Bias and Mr. Journey.

Their sentence that was recommended before the departures was similar. They were sentenced to roughly the same guideline range. Mr. Journey testified in Mr. Hillman's case, as did Mr. Bias. They also testified in the Sadler matter.

The Court is aware of Mr. Journey's serious ailments that are currently being handled by the Bureau of Prisons. The same with Mr. Bias: what he has can be handled by the Bureau of Prisons. So it does not warrant a downward departure based on his physical health.

Now, as to Mr. Hillman, we'd love to get to the truth of what actually was going on.

We would note that at trial Mr. Bias, due to the lateness of the operation in the area, local pharmacies were not honoring his prescriptions or prescriptions that came from these clinics. So to get around that, Mr. Bias simply opened up two unlicensed dispensaries, one in each place: one on Eleventh Street and one on Findlay. He loaned Dr. Fantauzzi \$17,000 to begin a dispensary to subvert the need for outside physicians to review these prescriptions. Dr. Chong opened up a dispensary, unlicensed, in the Eleventh Street clinic that generated a large amount of cash. Again, the purpose was to subvert the need for an outside, unbiased, for lack of a

better word, set of eyes on what was going on. You couldn't stay in business without these dispensaries being open.

When those were shut down, Your Honor, by law enforcement, Mr. Bias then engaged in a business transaction with Mr. Hillman, providing him approximately \$220,000 in cash, again secretly, for Mr. Hillman to open up or try to open up a pharmacy in Piketon, Ohio. The Court has heard the testimony about that. Piketon is a small town in the middle of Route 23.

Oddly enough, that money wasn't even registered as any type of loan. We saw an unsigned promissory note for \$138,000 that Mr. Bias gave to Mr. Hillman with no way to collect.

We also learned from the trial that another \$75,000 in cash was provided without any type of agreement, signed or unsigned, that showed the dispensing of this cash.

So it's our opinion that the cash was meant to be hidden, that it was hidden, and it was intended to open up a pharmacy to allow Mr. Bias to stay in business distributing these pills in this area affecting and killing individuals.

That's why we have recommended the sentence that we had.

I know the Court's concerns about guideline ranges. To Mr. Bias' credit, we did not have to exhaust resources with him. He did plea. Like I said, we are concerned that he hedged what he said. Much of what he said didn't make sense when you look at the facts and the testimony of the other

witnesses.

But, Your Honor, you know, he was not a lamb led into the slaughter by Mr. Journey. He was well aware of what was going on and fought hard to stay in business despite the devastation that was taking place in Southern Ohio, and we'd ask the Court to sentence accordingly.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?
(No response.)

THE COURT: All right. Pursuant to 18 U.S.C.

3553(a)(4) and (a)(5), I have to impose a sentence which is consistent, as I deem appropriate, with the guideline imprisonment range and consistent with the possible sentences in this case but also reflects the nature and circumstances of this offense.

We've been through this a number of times, a number of co-defendants, but the defendant's co-conspirators operated these clinics that we talked about. They dispensed prescriptions for pain medication to persons who had no medical need for it. They were basically feeding addictions of many hundreds of people. The number of pills prescribed were in the thousands, if not millions. The defendant also helped sponsor other people in terms of filling prescriptions and setting up other clinics, and he did make the financial investment that Mr. Oakley spoke about just a moment ago.

As mentioned by defense counsel, he was raking in

thousands of dollars, and he was exposing the community to what has been described as an OxyContin plague in the Southern District of Ohio, specifically in the general Portsmouth area, so I have to take that into consideration.

In terms of his personal criminal history and characteristics, for a drug dealer of this magnitude they are not that significant. There are some brushes with the law and a couple of various deals in Kentucky and on this side of the river. However, he has had prior involvement with marijuana. He is no stranger to the illegal side of life, but he is not as severe as demonstrated by the Roman numeral characteristic II that comes with that.

So the sentence that I have to impose has to promote respect for the law and provide just punishment.

Mr. Journey and Mr. Bias each showed absolute disrespect for the law and, in fact, I think have demonstrated over a period of time that they thought they were above it at other times. So I have to impose a sentence which provides adequate criminal deterrence and protects the public from potential future endeavors. Both individuals have demonstrated unwillingness to disengage in criminal activity.

I am troubled by several things. One is the disparity in sentencing between Mr. Journey and Mr. Bias, so I'm going to take that into consideration. The other is the plea colloquy where I discussed Level 34, and also we discussed the

potential cap of ten years. But I believe I've made it clear in the situation that, consistent with the terms of Plea Agreement, I am not bound to follow either of those two recommendations if, in fact, the facts and evidence bear out not following those.

I watched Mr. Journey testify. I watched Mr. Bias testify. I was not impressed by either one of those gentlemen in terms of their candor on the witness stand.

So I am taking all of those facts into consideration.

I'm going to impose a sentence of 168 months in the Bureau of Prisons.

There is going to be a fine. Depending on how counsel feels, I have had defense counsel at different times believe that a fine has assisted in terms of placement in a prison or potential employment opportunities; I have had other defense counsel indicate that a fine has not been helpful to their incarcerated clients. In the past what I have done is impose a small fine and then indicated to counsel that if it ends up backfiring, you can file a motion and I will obviate it at a later date.

But I will leave it up to you guys whether or not a fine would be helpful or not. I don't know if you know.

MR. KELLER: In all fairness, I don't know that I can answer that.

THE COURT: All right. What I'm going to do then,

I'm going to impose a fine of \$2500. If, in fact, that becomes a hindrance on the prison account or does not help him in terms of inside-institution employment opportunities, he can contact you guys, file a motion, and I'll waive the fine.

The fine will be paid at \$25 a quarter while he's incarcerated if he's working in a non-UNICOR or Grade Five job, and up to 50 percent if he's working in a One to Four job.

If there is an unpaid balance at the time of his release,

I'm not going to schedule a payment. I'll waive it at that

time so any unpaid balance will be taken care of.

All right. The recommended term of supervised release is three years. Consistent with Mr. Bias and Mr. Journey's predilections for not complying with the law, I'm going to make a term of supervised release in this case of ten years.

He is to report upon his release within 72 hours to the Probation Department in the district within which he intends to reside.

He will be given the standard terms and conditions of probation, which are basically the same as they are for supervised release, including not comitting any federal, state or local crimes.

He's prohibited, not only during the term of supervised release but from here on out, from possessing, owning or using a firearm or dangerous ordnance.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Obviously he's not to be involved in illegal controlled substances. There will be drug-testing in 15 days and at least two tests thereafter. There is some history of alcohol abuse. If the Probation Department determines that an alcohol or drug assessment is appropriate, he will comply with whatever they ask him to do and will follow whatever recommendations they make in that department. The one-hundred-dollar special assessment is owing and due, as is the collection of a DNA sample. Forfeiture pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 853 is also granted. MR. LINK: Your Honor --THE COURT: Barb, you got anything? COURTROOM DEPUTY: There was a recommendation for some mental health treatment. THE COURT: I think that goes with the alcohol counseling. So if the Probation Department feels he needs some mental health and alcohol counseling, he will deal with that based upon their recommendation at the time. Anything else? COURTROOM DEPUTY: And can you just confirm again what the supervised release term is? THE COURT: Ten years. COURTROOM DEPUTY: Ten years. All right. THE COURT: Anything else, counsel? MR. LINK: Your Honor, I'd like to have a moment to

address the order of forfeiture, if we might?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. LINK: Your Honor, the government -- I believe Mr. Oakley misspoke when he mentioned \$6.7 million allegedly generated by this business. What the order has asked for is \$6,348,000.00, I believe, and that estimate has been obtained by essentially making a hypothetical estimate of revenues. They are estimating for two clinics 30 patients a day, five days a week at \$200 a patient.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this, Tim. Have you guys filed the preliminary forfeiture order yet or not?

MR. OAKLEY: Yes, we have. It's been signed by the Court.

THE COURT: Go ahead. Sorry.

MR. LINK: It's quite all right, Your Honor.

However, even assuming, without disputing any of the numbers, the 30 patients a day or \$200 a patient, that number would represent the gross proceeds of this business. Now, from those gross proceeds, of course, each of the doctors were paid at a base salary of \$26,000 per month. All of the employees of the clinic were paid. None of that money is being disgorged. The clinics were both paying rents, their utilities, their supplies and, of course, the \$10,000 a month that was given to Mr. Hillman. Then the net proceeds of those proceeds were split 50/50 between Mr. Bias and Mr. Journey.

```
1
        I've actually prepared, if I may, Your Honor --
 2
             THE COURT: Sure.
 3
             MR. LINK: -- just a brief --
 4
             THE COURT: Just hand a copy over to Mr. Oakley.
 5
             MR. LINK: Of course.
 6
        -- a brief selection with some of my own rough math, again
 7
    using the numbers provided by the government as far as the
 8
    months, the duration each of these clinics were opened.
 9
    salary calculation is actually taken from the motion for
    forfeiture on Dr. Chong.
10
             THE COURT: Let me ask you this.
                                               Tim, has the
11
12
    government started the levy against any of this yet?
13
             MR. OAKLEY: We have. I think there is --
14
             THE COURT: Have or have not?
             MR. OAKLEY: We have. I think there is an action
15
16
    against the 43,000 in the vehicle.
17
             THE COURT: Oh, that was the issue we went through
18
    with Hillman; right?
19
             MR. OAKLEY: Yes.
20
             THE COURT: Um, let's do this. Other than that,
    let's give counsel 30 days to put together a motion in
21
22
    opposition to the forfeiture amount calculated, and then we
23
    can deal with that. Is that okay?
24
             MR. OAKLEY: That's fine.
25
             THE COURT: All right. So is that okay, guys, 30
```

1 days? 2 MR. LINK: Yes, it is, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay. Now we've got a couple of 4 questions in terms of two issues: one is self-surrender and 5 the other is location. Anything to be heard on that? 6 MR. KELLER: Judge, with regard to the first, we 7 would ask for self-surrender and just indicate to the Court 8 that he has been on pretrial release for an extended period of 9 time. To my knowledge, there have been no issues that have been brought to the Court as to noncompliance with all of the 10 requirements that he has had. So at this point I would just 11 ask the Court to allow the self-surrender in light of that 13 representation. THE COURT: Keith, you're in the back; right? Is 14 15 there any issues in terms of his compliance in terms of conditions of release at this point in time? 16 17 OFFICER MANFRA: Your Honor, we've had no issues with 18 Mr. Bias. He has complied with everything we have directed 19 him to do. Pretrial does have some concern about the elevated 20 risk with the amount of time that he has been given. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Has he been on EMU or anything 22 like that? 23 OFFICER MANFRA: He was on a GPS unit --24 THE COURT: Starting out. 25 OFFICER MANFRA: -- supervision and was taken off of

that with his compliance.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm thinking maybe if we do a self-surrender we could reinstitute the EMU during that period of time, or would that be a problem?

MR. OAKLEY: Your Hoor, we would -- if the Court is entertaining a self-surrender, we would oppose it for multiple reasons.

One, there is no guide right now on Mr. Bias because that has been removed.

There is also a substantial amount of assets that are unaccounted for. Even using Mr. Link's amounts, which I don't believe are complete, there's almost \$2 million out there that we've never found. He has the assets. He has been living in other states with other driver's licenses.

We would ask that he be detained now. Failing that, we would ask that he be placed on electronic monitoring with a curfew, that there is no need for him to be traveling around.

THE COURT: I'm trying to -- this goes back. Refresh
-- didn't we have a problem with electronic monitoring before?
Weren't there some violations way back when, or am I thinking
of someone else?

OFFICER MANFRA: Your Honor, I'm not aware of any violations of any location monitoring before when he was on that. He was on a GPS unit. I do not believe they have a home phone line at the residence, so it would take a day for

us to get the equipment.

THE COURT: What's the situation on the multiple driver's license?

MR. OAKLEY: He had a Florida driver's license while he was living up here. I don't want to misstate, but I believe they had a condominium.

MR. LINK: Not that it amounts to anything, Your

Honor, but it was actually just a Florida state identification

card. It doesn't amount to a hill of beans.

MR. OAKLEY: Well, it amounts to fraud if he wasn't there.

MR. LINK: Same thing one way or the other. It's an out of state --

THE COURT: Guys, this is about whether or not he can be trusted to show up for his term of incarceration, which normally takes about 45 to 60 days to get a location. Do you have anything on the location itself? Close to home or --

MR. KELLER: Judge, I would want it to be close to home. He has multiple family members that are here and have been supportive. And there are -- in spite of what Mr. Oakley is representing, as far as we know Mr. Bias has limited sources of income and, quite frankly, has put himself at risk medically by putting off surgeries that we talked about when we first met him and it was a problem, and only in the recent past did he have that surgery. I think he's allowed himself

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

to deteriorate. I don't believe he is suicidal. I think he's just made a decision because of finances, and I think he has shown himself to be reliable to the extent that he has fully complied, he's always come to our office, he's always contacted us, and he's been to every court proceeding. As Mr. Manfra says, there is no reason to suspect that that wouldn't be the same. THE COURT: Well, I mean, things do change. Keith, how long -- do you need Mr. Bias to organize whatever you've got, the GPS? OFFICER MANFRA: It would not require him to do anything. We would just have to get the equipment in by our provider. THE COURT: How long will that take? OFFICER MANFRA: I can have it by tomorrow. THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to hold him overnight. All right? When Keith tells me that he's got the mechanical stuff ready to go, then I'll release Mr. Bias. I don't want him untethered because of the significant sentence he's facing. So when Keith reports that he is good to go, that will be the deal. Does that work with you, Keith? OFFICER MANFRA: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: And you can make the restrictions as tight as you want: curfew; whatever; not leave the residence.

```
1
    Anything you want to do, make sure you've got him bundled up.
 2
    All right?
 3
             OFFICER MANFRA: Okay, Your Honor.
 4
             THE COURT:
                         Is that okay?
 5
             OFFICER MANFRA:
                              Thank you.
 6
             THE COURT: You're welcome.
 7
             The objection would be noted.
 8
             MR. LINK: Thank you.
 9
             THE COURT: Anything else at this time?
             MR. OAKLEY: Not from the United States, Your Honor.
10
             COURTROOM DEPUTY: We do have one thing --
11
12
             THE COURT: Well, we can deal with the dismissal.
13
             MR. OAKLEY: We'll prepare the dismissal.
             THE COURT: I'll get to the notice of appeal.
14
15
        But Tracy, is there anything you want to say?
        Yes, sir?
16
17
             OFFICER MANFRA: Your Honor, they did make me aware
18
    that they did have a home phone line installed at the house --
19
             THE COURT: Okay.
20
             OFFICER MANFRA: -- which we could use our base unit
21
    which would just monitor him in the house. We can probably do
22
    that today upstairs. But that would not monitor anywhere
23
    else.
24
             MR. OAKLEY: He could stay on house arrest, Your
2.5
    Honor.
```

3

5

6

7

8

9

18

25

```
1
             THE COURT: So obviously he'd have to be on house
    arrest until other arrangements can be made or some kind of --
             OFFICER MANFRA: Correct, Your Honor.
 4
             THE COURT: I'm okay with that. As long as you're
    satisfied that you can make conditions sufficient that you've
    got an eye on him, I'm okay with that.
             OFFICER MANFRA: Okay.
             THE COURT: Is that all right then?
             OFFICER MANFRA: Yes, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: All right. Should he be free to go now?
10
    Should we hold him for a period of time?
11
12
             OFFICER MANFRA: As long as I can verify the phone
13
    line here, as soon as -- now I can go get the phone number,
    verify the phone line and have that done here shortly. Then I
14
15
    would know if he would be ready to go on the monitoring.
16
    of right now, I'm taking the word of his girlfriend that a
    phone line is working and in place.
17
             MR. LINK: Mr. Bias has represented the same to me,
19
    Your Honor.
20
             THE COURT: Yeah, I'm sure, but I'd like to check it
21
    out.
22
        Do you want to give me a ballpark, Keith? I mean, I hate
23
    to put you on the spot.
24
             OFFICER MANFRA: I can find out within 15 minutes.
             THE COURT: Okay. Well, why don't we -- after I go
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
through the rights of appeal and all that stuff, we'll just
ask Mr. Bias and his lawyers to stay in the courtroom for a
few minutes while we take care of other matters.
         MR. KELLER: Judge, that's perfectly all right.
         THE COURT: All right.
         OFFICER MANFRA: Just a point of clarification, Your
Honor?
         THE COURT: Yes, sir.
         OFFICER MANFRA: Would we like to keep him on that
type of monitoring permanently until he surrenders or would we
like to move him to the GPS unit once the equipment comes in?
         THE COURT: I'm thinking the house arrest concept is
probably the smartest for the time being, and then you guys
can talk with Tracy. If there's some reason that it's not
working, we can make an adjustment. But I think if he's home
with his family, that's better than being in the hoosegow;
right?
         THE DEFENDANT:
                        Yes, sir.
         THE COURT: Let's start off with that and see where
it goes.
         OFFICER MANFRA: Okay, Your Honor.
         MR. LINK: Thank you, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Tim, before I do the appeal, anything
else?
        MR. OAKLEY: No, sir.
```

1 THE COURT: Anything else before I advise him of his 2 rights to appeal? 3 MR. KELLER: No, Your Honor. MR. LINK: No. 4 5 THE COURT: Mr. Bias, both sides have the right to 6 appeal the sentence that I've just pronounced, not just you 7 but also Mr. Oakley. 8 You have two options. Number one, as you sit here today, if you say, "Judge, I'm not happy with the sentence and I know I want to appeal it," then Barb will start the paperwork to 10 get that underway. If you want to consult with your counsel, 11 see what it all means, decide which way to go, then you've got 13 14 days from the date the entry goes on, which will probably be -- probably not this afternoon but probably this tomorrow. 14 15 So I'll ask you and your lawyers: As you sit here today, do you know if you wish to appeal the sentence or do you wish 16 a few days to think it over? 17 18 THE DEFENDANT: I'd like to talk to my attorneys, 19 Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 Counsel, if Mr. Bias indicates that he wants to appeal the 22 sentence, will you protect his interests in that regard and 23 make sure everything is filed in a timely fashion? 24 MR. LINK: We certainly will, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: All right. So how do we want to handle

```
-- do we need to have a hearing on their response on the
1
 2
    forfeiture?
 3
             MR. OAKLEY: What I would do is, I would ask the
    Court to set it for a hearing. We'll have someone in the
 4
 5
    office -- I think Karen Moss is working on the forfeiture.
 6
             THE COURT: Why don't we set that before Mr. Bias'
 7
    surrender date so he can be here? So if you guys need 30 days
 8
    to file a motion, could we -- I think we would be safe doing
    it within ten days.
        Tim, how much time do you need? You'll have your facts
10
    organized; right?
11
12
             MR. OAKLEY: Yes, sir.
13
             THE COURT: So if we set a hearing date, a hard
14
    hearing date, say, 40 days out?
             MR. OAKLEY: Your Honor, I think that would be fine.
15
16
    I'll talk to Miss Moss to clarify. If there's an issue, I'll
17
    call the Court.
18
             THE COURT: Is that okay, guys?
19
             MR. KELLER: That's fine, Your Honor.
20
             MR. LINK: Yes, Your Honor.
21
             THE COURT: Barb, you want to go out about 40 days
    for a hearing date?
22
23
             COURTROOM DEPUTY: I'm looking at possibly -- can you
24
    do July 15th, which is a Tuesday? We can do three o'clock in
    the afternoon.
2.5
```

1 MR. OAKLEY: That's fine with the United States. 2 MR. LINK: What was the time, Miss Crum? 3 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Three p.m. 4 THE COURT: Then do me a favor. If you guys think we're getting into any kind of evidentiary presentation, 5 notify the Court and we'll try to move the time up. Okay? 6 7 MR. LINK: Certainly, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Do you have a response already? 9 OFFICER MANFRA: Not yet, Your Honor. I have to speak with Mr. Bias. 10 Fine. 11 THE COURT: Okay. 12 So Tracy, if you're released, it's under the terms and 13 conditions we just spoke about, basically house arrest with the telephone monitoring and lockdown-type situation. 14 other terms of the former pretrial release will remain in full 15 force and effect until you get a designation. You'll get 16 notification from the Bureau of Prisons of when and where to 17 18 be. You have to be there at that time; otherwise, that's a 19 violation of bond and subject to a whole new line of offenses. 20 All right? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 22 THE COURT: In the meantime, you'll figure out 23 whether or not you want to appeal. We'll also have the 24 forfeiture hearing. Mr. Bias will be present if his presence 2.5 is needed.

1 Anything else? 2 MR. OAKLEY: No, sir. 3 THE COURT: Yeah, Barb? COURTROOM DEPUTY: Should we put in the Judgment and 4 5 Commitment order the -- at least a date beyond July 15th just 6 in case --7 THE COURT: That's okay. So we'll treat it either as a stay until that date or -- yeah, yeah, exactly. We'll cover 8 9 that. COURTROOM DEPUTY: 10 Okay. 11 THE COURT: All right. Anything else on the record 12 of any kind? 13 MR. KELLER: Nothing further, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Any objections -- I think for 14 15 Court of Appeals purposes you guys should preserve any 16 objections you think need to be made as to the sentence 17 imposed. So I don't know who wants to handle that. I think 18 you have to restate with some particularity what you've 19 already said, unfortunately. 20 So who wants to handle that? 21 MR. LINK: Thank you, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Yes. 23 MR. LINK: For the record, we would -- acknowledging 24 that the Court has sentenced him within the guideline levels 2.5 to a Level 34, if I'm not mistaken, we would object as to the

government's allowed breach of the Plea Agreement, what we see as a breach of the Plea Agreement.

It is our position that, under the Plea Agreement, the government was required to move to withdraw Mr. Bias' plea in the event that he didn't cooperate or request no more than ten years in the event that he did cooperate. One way or the other, the government was required to act. It did not file a Motion to Withdraw his plea, instead took his testimony and put him on the stand in open court.

We would say at this point the egg can't be unscrambled, would have to essentially -- the government would be bound to comply with their obligations, and we would request a term of no more than ten years.

THE COURT: Tim, I don't know if you need to respond at this time or not.

MR. OAKLEY: Your Honor, if we could, I guess I'm kind of -- I'm a little confused that, again, the objection is not an objection to the guideline range but the United States not taking away the acceptance and going to trial, which would only hinder Mr. Bias considering the entirety of the plea. The Court has sentenced Mr. Bias to a level of time lower than what the guideline recommendation was. I don't consider the United States in breach. If anyone breached their obligation, it was Mr. Bias.

But, you know, to claim now that the United States was

obligated to take away any benefit that Mr. Bias received by his admissions, in part, to what he did seems to be a little absurd. But if that's the case, the United States would just simply remove -- we've got seven days. If the Court would want us to file a Motion to Withdraw the plea, go to trial with the statements admitted as per the entire Plea Agreement -- that's our contract -- we would be willing to do that too.

THE COURT: I think I've already made my position clear on the record that that's not necessary. The government says that even if they dispute Mr. Bias' honest and complete testimony, it does not entitle him to withdraw his plea once it's entered. He has entered that plea.

The government has disputed the honesty and completeness of his testimony, which I think under paragraph 16 kicks everything back to me where Mr. Bias acknowledged at the time of the plea that I am permitted to look at all the offense factors, the recommendations and decide what is appropriate and what is not appropriate.

In any event, I don't think that measure is necessary. As I've already indicated, I think the government made its position in terms of cooperation known in a Sentencing Memorandum which is essentially a motion, I guess. I mean, I treat it as a motion of noncompliance.

So I think we've covered the record in that regard.

MR. KELLER: Judge, if I may? One other issue that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Link didn't bring up is with regard to the disparity. don't know what Bart Journey's criminal history is. THE COURT: It was worse. MR. KELLER: I assumed it was worse by his testimony in an earlier trial --THE COURT: Yeah. MR. KELLER: -- but there's still the issue of disparity. The Court had shared with counsel earlier that the Court was not impressed, and I don't want to misquote Your Honor, with either Mr. Bias' testimony or Mr. Journey's testimony. So it just seems that they're on equal footing, so to speak, with a criminal history that's worse for Mr. Journey. And we could argue about the severity of the mental -- or the physical conditions. I don't want to get into that, but it's still almost a threefold increase. So I would just leave it at that. THE COURT: Well, I thought I was clear on that; maybe I was not. In arriving at the 168 months, I took into consideration the paragraphs in the Plea Agreement as well as the sentence I handed out to Mr. Journey. So considering the discussion of the 34, considering the discussion of the possible cap, considering where Mr. Journey ended up and Mr. Bias' involvement in this conspiracy as, frankly, the principal, that's how I ended up where I did. I did consider

```
1
    all those factors.
 2
             MR. KELLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
 3
             THE COURT: Anything else?
             MR. KELLER: Nothing further, Judge.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: I'll ask you guys to just step in the
 6
    back until Keith is organized and he can report back.
 7
        Barb, what's is the next case, which one?
 8
             COURTROOM DEPUTY: The next one is U.S. versus Mark
 9
    Fantauzzi.
             THE COURT: Well, Ransom is here. Why don't we just
10
    go straight into that? I understand Mr. Fantauzzi is not
11
    present; correct?
13
             COURTROOM DEPUTY: Correct.
14
             THE COURT: Where is Ransom?
15
        Ransom, come on up.
16
        Thank you, guys.
17
             MR. LINK: Thank you, Your Honor.
18
             MR. KELLER: Thank you.
19
             THE COURT: So that's the order of the Court, which I
20
    guess I should say I consider it to be fair and reasonable in
21
    light of the appropriate sentencing factors and discussions we
22
    have had.
23
        Okay.
               Thank you.
24
        (The proceedings concluded at 11:00 a.m.)
25
```

CERTIFICATE I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER. S/MARYANN T. MAFFIA, RDR Official Court Reporter